



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/549,580	09/19/2005	Katsuyoshi Oki	050568	1185
23850 7590 08/06/2008 KRATZ, QUINTOS & HANSON, LLP 1420 K Street, N.W. Suite 400 WASHINGTON, DC 20005				
EXAMINER				
HUANG, WEI WU				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2618				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/06/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/549,580

Applicant(s)

OKI, KATSUYOSHI

Examiner

WEN W. HUANG

Art Unit

2618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 July 2008.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9 and 11-16 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 9 and 11-16 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-8, 10 and 17-20 are cancelled.

Claims 9 and 11-16 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 9, 11, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al. (US. 7,286,857 B1; hereinafter "Walker"), Oberlaender (US. 6,160,997), Joglekar et al. (US. 5,535,258; hereinafter "Joglekar") and Mazzara, Jr et al. (US. 7,215,950 B2; hereinafter "Mazzara")

Regarding **claim 9**, Walker teaches a vehicle-mounted acoustic apparatus (see Walker, fig. 1, handset controller 14) that is connectable to a mobile phone (see Walker fig. 1, handset 12 and link 16) to receive hands-free conversations from the mobile phone (see Walker, col. 3, lines 60-64); and which comprises a microphone for collecting the sounds of a user, and a speaker for producing the sounds of a radio broadcast or a conversing party (see Walker, fig. 4, speaker/mic 216/220), the vehicle mounted acoustic apparatus being operable according to a first mode of

selecting one of a plurality of phone numbers that are stored in storing means of the acoustic apparatus (see Walker, fig 1, memory 20; col. 3, lines 65-67; col. 5, lines 60-66) by pushing one of plurality of preset keys (see Walker, col. 3, lines 65-67; col. 5, lines 60-66) and

transmitting a notification of directing a call to the mobile phone (see Walker, col. 2, lines 1-3), each of the plurality of phone numbers being stored in the storing means (see Walker, fig. 1, memory 20), the notification instructing the mobile phone to call a phone number that is read from the storing means (see Walker, fig. 1, memory 20) corresponding to the pushed preset key (see Walk, col. 3, lines 22-42).

Walker is silent to teaching that a vehicle-mounted acoustic apparatus is capable of receiving radio broadcasts and operable according to a first mode of

selecting one of a plurality of phone numbers by pushing one of plurality of preset keys that are also used to select the frequency of radio broadcasts, and each of the plurality of phone numbers being stored with its unique ID number, the plurality of preset keys being associated with the ID numbers, and the notification instructing to call a phone number having the ID number corresponding to the pushed preset key, and

wherein numerals or symbols that constitute a phone number to be stored in the storing means are input using the plurality of preset keys, and the numerals or symbols that are input with one press of one of the plurality of preset keys differ from those input with two succeeding presses of the one of the plurality of preset keys However, the claimed limitation is well known in the art as evidenced by Oberlaender, Joglekar and Mazzara.

In the same field of endeavor, Oberlaender teaches that a vehicle-mounted acoustic apparatus (see Oberlaender, fig. 1, operating unit 120) is capable of receiving radio broadcasts (see Oberlaender, col. 3, lines 39-46) and operable according to a first mode of

selecting one of a plurality of phone numbers by pushing one of plurality of preset keys that are also used to select the frequency of radio broadcasts (see Oberlaender, col. 4, lines 4-13),

wherein numerals or symbols that are input with one press of one of the plurality of preset keys differ from those input with two succeeding presses of the one of the plurality of preset keys (see Oberlaender, col. 5, lines 58-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made at the time of the invention was made to combine the teaching of Walker with the teaching of Oberlaender in order to minimize the impairment of driving safety during the use of radio and telephone (see Oberlaender, col. 2, lines 5-9).

The combination of Walker and Oberlaender is silent to teaching that wherein each of the plurality of phone numbers being stored with its unique ID number, the plurality of preset keys being associated with the ID numbers, and the notification instructing to call a phone number having the ID number corresponding to the pushed preset key, and

wherein numerals or symbols that constitute a phone number to be stored in the storing means are input using the plurality of preset keys. However, the claimed limitation is well known as evidenced by Joglekar and Mazzara.

In the same field of endeavor, Joglekar teaches that wherein each of the plurality of phone numbers being stored with its unique ID number, the plurality of preset keys being associated with the ID numbers (see Joglekar, fig. 3, col. 6, lines 16-39), and the notification instructing to call a phone number having the ID number corresponding to the pushed preset key (see Joglekar, fig. 8, M1 318 and M2 324; col. 10, lines 15-50).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teaching of Walker and Oberlaender with the teaching of Joglekar in order to minimize the attention required for drivers for vehicles to dial phone calls (see Joglekar, col. 2, lines 23-38).

The combination of Walker, Oberlaender and Joglekar is silent to teaching that wherein numerals or symbols that constitute a phone number to be stored in the storing means are input using the plurality of preset keys. However, the claimed limitation is well known as evidenced by Mazzara.

In the same field of endeavor, Mazzara teaches that (see Mazzara, telematics unit 115) wherein numerals or symbols that constitute a phone number (see Mazzara, col. 6, lines 15-28) to be stored in the storing means (see Mazzara, col. 1, line 20) are input using the plurality of preset keys (see Mazzara, fig. 1, keys 131-136; col. 6, lines 60-66 and col. 7, table 1 and 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teaching of Walker, Oberlaender and Joglekar with the teaching of Mazzara in order to provide an efficient and uncomplicated method for putting telephone numbers (see Mazzara, col. 1, lines 21-24).

Regarding **claim 11**, the combination of Walker, Oberlaender, Joglekar and Mazzara also teaches the vehicle-mounted acoustic apparatus according to claim 10, wherein there are k preset keys deployed in order from a first preset key, wherein pressing the n th preset key once enters a number n , and wherein pressing the n th key twice enters a number $k+n$, where k and n are positive integers (see Joglekar, fig. 8, M1 318 and M2 324; col. 10, lines 15-50).

Regarding **claim 15**, the combination of Walker, Oberlaender, Joglekar and Mazzara also teaches the vehicle-mounted acoustic apparatus according to claim 9 being operable according to a third mode for inputting a phone number using the plurality of preset keys and for calling the input number with the mobile phone (see Mazzara, col. 60-66 and col. 7, table 1 and 2); and

Wherein the storing means stores the phone number input in the third mode (see Walker, fig. 1, memory 20; col. 3, lines 65-67; col. 5, lines 60-66).

Regarding **claim 16**, the combination of Walker, Oberlaender, Joglekar and Mazzara also teaches the vehicle-mounted acoustic apparatus according to claim 11,

Art Unit: 2618

wherein n is equal to six (see Mazzara, fig. 1, buttons 131-136) and 11th and 12th numbers present "*" and "#" respectively (see Mazzara, col. 7, table 1).

2. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker, Oberlaender, Joglekar and Mazzara as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Chua et al. (US. 6,690,956 B2; hereinafter "Chua")

Regarding **claim 12**, the combination of Walker, Oberlaender, Joglekar and Mazzara teaches a vehicle-mounted acoustic apparatus according to claim 9, the vehicle mounted acoustic apparatus being operable according to a second mode of selecting one of a plurality of phone numbers by pushing one of plurality of preset keys (see Walker, col. 3, lines 65-67; col. 5, lines 60-66) that are also used to select the frequency of radio broadcasts (see Oberlaender, col. 4, lines 4-13), and transmitting a notification of directing a call to the mobile phone (see Walker, col. 2, lines 1-3), each of the plurality of phone numbers being stored with its unique ID number, the plurality of preset keys being associated with the ID numbers (see Joglekar, fig. 3, col. 6, lines 16-39), the notification instructing the mobile phone to call a phone number having the ID number corresponding to the pushed preset key (see Joglekar, fig. 8, M1 318 and M2 324; col. 10, lines 15-50) (see Walker, col. 3, lines 22-42).

The combination of Walker, Oberlaender, Joglekar and Mazzara is silent to teaching that wherein the second mode of selecting one of a plurality of phone numbers that are stored in the mobile phone, each of the plurality of phone numbers being stored

in the mobile phone. However, the claimed limitation is well known as evidenced by Chua.

In the same field of endeavor, Chua teaches a vehicle-mounted acoustic (see Chua, fig. 7, vehicle 720) apparatus operable according to a first mode of selecting one of a plurality of phone numbers that are stored in the mobile phone, each of the plurality of phone numbers being stored in the mobile phone (see Chua, col. 1, lines 43-60).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teaching of Walker, Oberlaender, Joglekar and Mazzara with the teaching of Chua in order to allow safe driving with using wireless phones (see Chua, col.1 lines 13-17).

3. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker, Oberlaender, Joglekar and Mazzara as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Howard (US. 3,980,823).

Regarding **claim 13**, the combination of Walker, Oberlaender, Joglekar and Mazzara teaches the vehicle-mounted acoustic apparatus according to claim 9, wherein using the plurality of the preset keys, numerals that constitute a phone number to be stored in the storing means are input (see Mazzara, col. 6, lines 60-65).

The combination of Walker, Oberlaender, Joglekar and Mazzara is silent to teaching that

wherein each of the plurality of preset keys is associated with a display pattern that corresponds to an upper portion or a lower portion of a form by which the numerals from "0" to "9" are displayed; and a phone number are input by entering the upper portion and the lower portion of the form by which the numerals are displayed. However, the claimed limitation is well known in the art as evidenced by Howard.

In a related art, Howard teaches a keyboard for telecommunication (see Howard, col. 1, lines 48-50),

wherein each of a plurality of present keys (see Howard, fig. 1, keys 1-8) is associated with a display pattern that corresponds to an upper portion or a lower portion of a form by which the numerals from "0" to "9" are displayed (see Howard, fig. 3, col. 2, lines 32-34); and

wherein a phone number are input by entering the upper portion and the lower portion of the form by which the numerals are displayed (see Howard, col. 3, lines 10-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teaching of Walker, Oberlaender, Joglekar and Mazzara with the teaching of Howard in order to provide an electronic keyboard which can be easily used with one hand (see Howard, col. 1, lines 36-38).

4. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker, Oberlaender, Joglekar, Mazzara and Howard as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Piguet (US. 4,199,751).

Regarding **claim 14**, the combination of Walker, Oberlaender, Joglekar and Howard teaches the vehicle-mounted acoustic apparatus according to claim 13.

The combination of Walker, Oberlaender, Joglekar and Howard is silent to teaching that comprises a display portion having segment groups, each of the segment groups constituted by seven segments. However, the claimed limitation is well known in the art as evidenced by Piguet.

In a related art, Piguet teaches a keyboard that comprises a display portion having segment groups, each of the segment groups constituted by seven segments (see Piguet, fig. 1, col. 2, lines 46-50; col. 2, line 63 – col. 3, line 5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as the time of the invention was made to combine the teaching of Walker, Oberlaender, Joglekar and Howard with the teaching of Piguet in order to implement a small sized keyboard (see Piguet, col. 1, lines 53-60).

Response to Amendment

Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to WEN W. HUANG whose telephone number is (571)272-7852. The examiner can normally be reached on 10am - 6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew D. Anderson can be reached on (571) 272-4177. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2618

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/W. W. H./

Examiner, Art Unit 2618

/Matthew D. Anderson/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2618